APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,798	07/08/2005	Michael R Song	1041-0001WOUS	4211

49698   7590   08/11/2008
MICHAUD-DUFFY GROUP LLP
306 INDUSTRIAL PARK ROAD
SUITE 206
MIDDLETOWN, CT 06457

EXAMINER
LIANG, VEI CHUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action **Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**	10/541,798	SONG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	VEI-CHUNG LIANG	2169

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>28 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: <u>3</u>.

Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
   See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Pierre M. Vital/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)   **Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**   Part of Paper No. 20080804

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The newly added limitation to claim 17 of the instant application raises new issues that require further search and consideration because the proposed amendments change the scope of the claimed invention. (e.g. "flexible for customization to priorities of an industry" of amended claim 17).

On page 9, Claim Objection section, the applicant proposed to amend claim 17 to remove the clause "adapted to particular needs" and replace with a term further reciting the inventive storage paradigm. However, such amendment introduces new issues which require further search and consideration.

On page 9, claim rejection section, regarding claim 18, the applicant's representative argues that claim 18 does comply with the written description requirement set forth in 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. The Examiner appreciates the representative for providing the detailed table showing the portions in the specification support the claimed limitations in claim 18. However, after carefully studying the cited portions and comparing with the claimed limitation, the examiner respectfully submits that the portions cited in the original filed specification do not support the claimed limitation in claim 18 as set forth in the previously mailed Office Action on May 28, 2008. For example, the first limitation in the claim 18 recites "maintianing a minimum number of electronic storage locations by eliminating software application default storage locations". On the other hand, the paragraph 0034 in the specification is referred to "1. Central Computer Repository Rule - save all KID of COTA system's 100 UKIDS 160 under the TAO 210 and COTA 220 categories. When dealing with electronic KID, some predefined software application storage location defaults should be overridden, e.g. MICROSOFT WORD's "C:\My Documents\Word" default. The inventors have discovered that fewer storage locations equates to greater ease of navigation and higher productive." Paragraph 0034 does not support the statement of "maintaining a minimum number of electronic storage location" but only support "the inventors have discovered that fewer storage locations equates to greater ease of navigation and higher productive.

Another example is given by the representative stating that the limitation of "implementing a minimum number of total electronic and physical storage location" is supported by paragraph 0035, which recites "2. Maximm Extensibility rules - extend the COTA 220 and TAO 210 categories to every storage platform. The logical partitions 220 span such storage structures as computer hard drives, mainframe and file servers, Internet and Internet websites, email applications, public folders, portable electronic devices (PDAs) computer links, computer desktop, real desktop, filing cabinet, CD ROM libraries, bookshelves, and the like. The goal is to implement one storage system." However, the paragraph does not support implementing a minimum number of total electronic and physical storage location.

The above mentioned examples are just two of the examples of the reason why the specification does not support the claimed limitation in claim 18. Therefor the rejection to claim 18 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph is proper and maintained.

On page 12, regarding claim 1, 16, and 22, the representative argues that Chu does not teach the limitation of "an interface ...providing a plurality of logical partitions for segregating and storing said KID in a priority-based and standardized scheme within said UKIDS,..and further providing rules and tools for configuring said UKIDS and for storing and accessing KID included therein". The representative agues that the API is for querying and retrieving.

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that Chu teaches above mentioned limitation as a knowledge repository sever system may contain both similar and different APIs from other knowledge repository server systems. For example, all knowledge repository server systems may contain general API that retrieves all models contained in their own knowledge repositories. Knowledge repository server systems may also contain different APIs in order to provide information specific to their respective knowledge repositories. Knowledge repository server system contain APIs specific to how decision tree model are structured (Chu, paragraph 0022). Since the API in Chu specifies how decision tree model are structured, the API in Chu teaches the storing and accessing individual knowledge repositories.

On page 12, regarding claim 1, 16, and 22, the representative argues that the combination of teaching of Chu and Kemp does not teach the limitation of "a first level of said logical partitions segregates KID storage into personal and professional levels" by noting "it is advantageous to break down information within a given field into a number of analytical topics, such as those listed herein as examples within the legal field".

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits, with broadest interpretation, that the logical partitions segregating KID into personal and professional level" is equivalent of breaking down information within a given field into a number of analytical topic because the term "segregating" in the claim limitation can be interpreting as separating from the general mass (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary) which is equivalent of breaking up. And the term "logical partitions which segregate" can be interpreted as breaking down information into a number of analytical topics. Furthermore, the example topics such as property, real estate, ownership are considered as personal and professional. Therefore the combination of Chu and Kemp does teach the limitations recited in Claim 1, 16, and 22.

On page 14, the representative argues that with the broadest interpretation, the claimed limitation "universal knowledge, information, and data store (UKIDS)" must be interpreted as pertaining to more than more industry. As to the above argument, the examiner respectfully submits that by interpreting the claim in light of the specification, the UKIDS, in the context of the disclosure, "is intended to broadly define a single, scalable, data management structure that extended across virtually all data management platforms including, for example, computer hard drives, computer email archives, computer desktops, office desk tops, filing cabinets, bookshelves, and the like" (Specification, paragraph 0021). Therefore, the examiner is interpreting the meaning of the "universal" is not to intended to cover more than more industry but to cover different kinds of storage devices. Therefore, the response to the argument is proper and maintained.

On page 15, regarding claim 18, the representative agues that the combination of Chu, Kemp, and Multer does not teach the limitations in claim 18. As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that Multer teaches such limitation as the universal record format allows the application objects to support a wide range of extensible application item types such as contacts, calendar, mail, bookmarks, and the like. Flexible type name and value associations permit synchronization without regard to individual vendor application information formats. Each application object encapsulates mapped knowledge from the vendor unique format to the universal format of the present invention. As such, an application object can be designed to support any combination of application and binary information types. In essence, application objects can be designed to support a vendor application using only binary file synchronization if the internal format of the application is not known. (Multer, paragraph 0191) And In one particular aspect of the present invention, encoding of the data packages may be provided in a streaming format to allow processing by the device engines with minimal storage and memory configuration at the device engine level (Multer, paragraph 0236).

On page 16, regarding claim 19, the representative argues that the combination of Chu, Kemp, and Harrow does not teach the limitation of claim 19. As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "wherein said rules for purging KID include, at a predetermined time period: separating KID into a first category of KID that is needed, a second category of KID that is not needed but retained on hand, and a third category of KID that is not needed and not retained; purging said third category; and placing said second category into a long term storage location" as purging of content in the system related to the ability to remove distributed copies of a file from the systems the files were distributed to. This maybe tied into the expiry date of a file, which may be set by the author, or the necessity to recall a file which had already been distributed. One method of doing this may be by using a domain administrator's account to automatically purge the relevant content. Another way of doing this would be to have an agent program running which would listen for requests from the system. On receiving a request to delete a file, it would remove the file from the local directory (Harrow, paragraph 0075).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include purge policy in view of Harrow. Doing so would provide a means for effectively maintain necessary documents to the clients.

On page 17, regarding claim 20, the representative argues that the combination of Chu, Kemp, and Francis does not teach the limitation recited in claim 20. As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Chu and Kemp does not explicitly teach "wherein said rules for purging KID include, when an employee leaves a position, providing a copy of said plurality of personal levels to said employee, moving said plurality of personal levels to a long term storage location, and purging said personal levels from said UKIDS". On the other hand, Francis teaches such limitation as when an employee leaves a company, much of their every day expertise remains behind in notebooks and reports. Most of this information is not the highly confidential information about the employer's business, but everyday skills like what to when a particular machine has a certain problem, or what pitfalls occur when running a particular type of experiment. All "green" access coded question and answer pairs are not sensitive and thus the subset asked by an individual may be retained to form his or her personal knowledge base. Since Company 30 wants to protect its confidential (red coded) and semi-confidential (amber-coded) materials from falling into the hands of competitors they will probably not allow individuals to retain these items in personal databases. Nevertheless, the green coded items will still represent a significant advance on the inconvenience of losing all notes by leaving notebooks with the employer (Francis, paragraph 0162).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include policy regarding knowledge be retained with the leaving employee in view of Francis. Doing so would provide a means for effectively distinguishing personal knowledge from confidential knowledge relevant to leaving employees.

On page 18, regarding claim 21, the representative argues that the combination of Chu, Kemp, and Manohar does not teach the limitation in claim 21. As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Chu and Kemp does not explicitly teach "wherein said rules for sharing and distributing KID include: prior to when an employee leaves a position, having said employee provide their successor employee a tour of said plurality of logical partitions within said UKIDS and identify important KID stored therein; identifying to a recipient receiver a targeted location for storing distributed KID within one of said plurality of logical partitions; and employing quantity reduction and content quality improvement goals for reducing a volume of distributed KID". On the other hand, Manohar teaches such limitation as browsers enabled with the touring features of the present invention would be capable of interactive network assisted navigation and touring of one more web sites with abilities to branch out a tour and resume the tour at the last node, and insert tours within a tour. Tours can also be used as an artifact for exchanging viewpoints between users rather exchange URLs and recommended traversal path (Manohar, paragraph 0105).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include a tour for the users to exchange URLs of documents in view of Manohar. Doing so would provide a means for effectively exchange knowledge from between employees.

.

/Vei-Chung Liang, Ph.D./
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169